4036. L. 13

A TREATISE OF THE VNVVRITTEN WORD OF GOD, commonly called TRADITIONS.

Written in Latin by the R. Father Iames Gordon Huntley *of* Scotland, *Doctour of Diuinity, of the Society of Iesus.*

And translated into English by I. L. of the same Society.

The second Part of the first Controuersy.

Permissu Superiorum, M. DC. XIV.

THE FIRST CHAPTER.

Of the true ſtate of the Queſtion.

HAVING already in the precedent Treatiſe ſpoken of the written Word of God, and of all other things therunto belonging, now it remayneth we ſpeake a litle of the vnwritten word cõmonly called Traditiõs. But to the end that the ſtate of this controuerſy may more eaſily be vnderſtood, I will heere ſet downe foure things diligently to be conſidered in this matter we treate of. The firſt is, that by the vnwritten Word we only vnderſtand that which is not written in the old or new Teſtament, for of the vnwritten word of God in this ſenſe is our whole Controuerſy in this place. Wherefore that obiection

ction of our Aduerſaries is both friuolous and nothing worth, to wit, that the word of God which we call the vnwriten word, may be found extant eyther amonge the holy Fathers, or in the books of the Councells, or other Canons of the Church. But this nothing belongeth vnto this purpoſe: for it is ſufficient for vs that this word of God is not written in any booke, eyther of the old or new Teſtament.

2. The ſecond is that a thing may be cõteined in the holy Scripture 2. wayes. The one way is implicite, that is to ſay, in ſome generall principle from whence this other may be certaynly deduced, and in this ſenſe we acknowledge that the whole word of God is conteined in holy writ, and not only in Scripture, but alſo in the Apoſtles Creed, yea euen in that one article, *I beleiue the Catholike Church*, ſo that it be diligently examined and well vnderſtood, as *S. Auguſtine* very well noteth. For ſo, ſayth Chriſt, the whole Law and Prophets doe depend vpon two precepts of charity, as in the ſame place S. *Auguſtine* noteth. For ſeing that the holy Scripture teacheth that we are bound to beleiue the Church in all things, & that it can neyther deceiue vs nor be deceiued, as we will euidently proue in the next Controuerſy in the 3. Chapter

S. Aug. in the 140. queſt. vpon Exodus. Tom. 4. Matt. 22. v. 40.

it consequently also teacheth the whole and entire word of God, seing that all that which is not expressed in the holy Scripture, is conteined expressly in the doctrine of the Church, the which the Scripture commendeth vnto vs as infallible; as S. *Augustine* very well sayth, and declareth in many places. For euen as God the Father comprehended in these few words (*This is my wellbeloued Sonne, heare him*) the whole word of God, so Christ proposed vnto vs the whole word of God, when he commaunded vs to heare the Church.

S. *Augustin. tom. 7. contra Crescon. Grammat. c. 33. & de vnit. Eccles. c. 22. in fine.*

3. And in this sense do the holy Fathers oftentymes say, that all the points of fayth are conteined in the holy Scriptures, to wit, in that generall principle in the which they admonish vs to believe the Church: but many of the holy Fathers sayings are falsifyed & corrupted by *Martin⁹ Kemnitius*, and some *Caluinists*, as may be seene in *Iudocus Ruesten* in his first tome defending the Councell of *Trent* against *Kemnitius*.

Matt. 17. v. 5. Matt. 18. v. 17. Luc. 10. v. 16.

4. Secondly a thing may be conteined in expresse words in the holy Scriptures, as that Christ is borne, suffered, and risen againe &c. And in this sense we deny that the whole word of God is conteined in the Scriptures. That obiection of our Aduersaries by this may easily be answered, when they

they say that we affirme, that Traditions are the vnwriten word of God, and yet we goe about to proue thē by Scriptures. For we do not proue euery particuler Tradition by expresse words of Scripture, but we only deduce and gather them out of it, and conuince in generall, that there are Traditions.

5. The third thing which is to be considered, is, that our Aduersaries being conuinced by truth, doe acknowledge that many things were deliuered vnto vs by the Apostles, besids those which are written. « But, say they, those were only externall « rites and ceremonies, seruing only for the « ornament or discipline of the Church, but « nothing concerning doctrine of fayth was « deliuered by the Apostles, which they haue not set downe in writing. So *Caluin* and some others which follow his opinion. Wherfore it remayneth for vs to proue that not only external ceremonies, but also those which belong vnto the doctrine of fayth were deliuered vnto vs by the Apostles, and that they were neuer expressely set downe in writing.

Caluin cōt. 4. sess. Con. Trident. in huo antid. Beza de notis Eccles. tom. 3. Tract. Theol. p. 337. edit. An. 1582.

6. The fourth thing is, that seing our Aduersaries cannot deny that which was obiected vnto them by Catholikes, to wit, that the Scripture in many places maketh expresse

expreſſe mentiō of the word of God preached, deliuered, and diuulged ouer the whole world (as we haue already declared euen out of the holy Scriptures) they are wont to answere, that long ſince in the Apoſtles tyme this word of God was deliuered, preached, and not written, but the Apoſtles afterwards ſet downe in writing all the preached word of God, or at the leaſt as much therof as was neceſſary vnto ſaluation. The which ſolutiō albeit it be very weake and friuolous, ſeing that it relyeth vpō no ſure ground, yet notwithſtanding that it may more fully be confuted we will declare hereafter, that many of the chiefeſt points of faith were not expreſſely ſet downe in writing by the Apoſtles. And thus much of the ſtate of this Queſtion.

CHAP. II.

Out of the first and chiefest principles of faith it is clearly convinced, that there are Traditions.

THE first argument wherby we proue *Traditions*, is taken out of some of the chiefest principles of faith. For there are three chiefe and most necessary points of faith, yea the chiefe grounds of our whole faith which are not to be found expressely in Scriptures.

2. The first, that there must needes be some Catalogue or Canon of the sacred Bookes aswell of the old as of the new Testament, the which all Christians with an assured faith should imbrace as a most certaine and an vndoubted truth, and this is a very necessary point of faith, yea of it dependeth the authority of all the bookes of holy Scripture, because by this Canon the sacred and true books of Scriptures are discerned and made knowne from all those which be Apochriphall; especially because aswell in times past as in these our daies there

there hath byn so many, and so great Controuersyes about the Canonicall and Apocryphall bookes of Scripture; and such a Canon was altogeather necessary aswell in the auncient Church before Christ, as in our present Church after Christes tyme; the which also our Aduersaries themselues haue learned by experience. For they haue also placed their new Canon of the bookes of holy Scripture in their *Confession* made at *Rochell*, and in the later end of some of their Bibles, and yet neyther in the tyme of the old Testament, nor in the tyme of the new Law, was this Canō euer written downe in the Bibles themselues. *Confess. Rupellana. Art. 3.*

2. I know our Aduersaries, that they may escape this argument, do runne to the inward instinct of the holy Ghost, wherby say they, we know what booke is Canonicall, and what is not. But this answere is refuted & reiected before, where we haue shewed that the holy Ghost doth not moue vs to believe any thing with the Catholike faith, which is not the word of God. If therfore the holy Ghost moue vs to believe that some bookes are Canonicall, and some are not, it is necessary that this be the word of God. We aske therefore of them, whether this is the written word of God or the vnwritte, if it be the written word, *Supra c. 5.*

in what Booke or Chapter is it to be found? if it be no where to be found, our Aduerſaries muſt needes cõfeſſe, that by the inſtinct of the holy Ghoſt they alſo beleiue the vnwritten word of God, or *Traditions*.

3. The ſecond principle of faith is, that we muſt neceſſarily, with an aſſured and firme faith beleiue, that all thoſe Bookes eyther of the old or of the new Teſtament which we now retaine, are ſafely deliuered vnto vs entyre and vncorrupted through ſo many handes, ſo many ages, ſo many vexations and perſecutions of the Chriſtians, for otherwyſe the whol credit and authority of thoſe bookes will decay and periſh. But this is no where extant or written, for neyther the Prophets or Apoſtles haue euer written, that their bookes ſhould neuer be falſified or corrupted by any, yea it appeareth ſufficiently by that which hath byn already ſaid that they were falſified and corrupted in many bookes by the Iewes and Heretikes. Let our Aduerſaries therfore tell vs where it is written, that this holy Scripture which we haue now, is not corrupted or falſifyed.

Supra c. 9. 10. 12. & 13

4. The third principle of fayth is the true ſenſe of the letter. For the true word of God conſiſteth rather in the true ſenſe or meaning

meaning of the words then in the words themselues as we haue declared before. But the true sense of the words, that is to say, in what sense or meaning the words are to be vnderstood, eyther properly or figuratiuely, cannot be had from the holy Scripture alone, but also from the doctrine and Traditions of the Church, as we haue sayd before in the fourth Chapter: whereby it also followeth, that the writte word of God conteyneth in it the least part of the word of God, to wit, the bare letter only; but the word of God preached and deliuered keepeth and professeth vnto vs the cheife part of the word of God, that is to say, the true & natiue sense of the same. *Supra. 3.*

5. And this is that which *S. Basil* sayth, that those who reiect the vnwriten points of fayth, as vndiscreet persons, do wrong and damnify the chiefe parts of the Gospell, yea they euen as it were cõtract or bring the whole preaching of the Gospell, to the bare name therof. *S. Basil. l. de Spiritu sanct. c. 27. Brent. contra Petrũ à Soto in suis prolegomenis.*

6. Many of our Aduersaries who deale more sincerely with vs, conuinced by these arguments, do acknowledge, that these grounds or principles of our faith are only to be had by Traditions, without any written word of God, as *Ioannes Brentius*, and *Martin Kemnitius*, who adde also, that those *Kemnitius contra 4. sess. Concil. Trid. cùm agit de 2. genere Tradit.*

those Traditions which doe not repugne to the written word of God are to be admitted and receiued of all, and those only are to be reiected which are oppofit vnto the holy Scriptures?

7. But whatſoeuer our Aduerſaries do anſwere, it is altogeather neceſſary that they confeſſe theſe three principles of our fayth do belong indeed to the very word of God it ſelfe. They muſt alſo needs confeſſe theſe are not extant in playne and expreſſe tearmes in any booke either of the old or new Teſtament; out of which neceſſarily followeth that the whole & intire word of God is not conteyned expreſly in the holy Scripture.

CHAP. III.

Wherein it is proued out of other particuler poynts of fayth, that there are Traditions.

THE ſecond argument whereby we proue Apoſtolicall Traditions, is taken out of other particuler poynts of fayth, the which almoſt all our Aduerſaryes belieue with vs, albeit they be no where expreſſely con-

conteyned in the Scriptures. There are many poyntes of fayth of this ſort, wherof for example ſake we will alledge ſome few. But to the end, we may vſe our accuſtomed breuity, we will rehearſe only thoſe which do alſo manifeſtly ſhew out of this opinion of our Aduerſaries (that nothing appertayneth to the doctrine of fayth, which is not expreſly conteyned in holy Scripture) there are many greeuous errours and hereſies in this our age ariſen.

2. The firſt point is, that in God there are three perſons really diſtinct among themſelues, and one only ſubſtance, for this is no where extant in holy Scripture, yea in it nothing is to be found expreſly writen eyther of the ſubſtance or of the perſon in that ſignifycation wherein theſe words are vſed, when we ſpeake of the Bleſſed Trinity.

3. This indeed the *Caluiniſts* to their great loſſe and domage haue ſufficiently learned by experience fourty yeares agoe in *Tranſiluania*. For when one *Iohn Huniader* whom they called *Iohn* the ſecod King of *Hũgary* was then Gouernour in *Tranſiluania*, a Coũtry or Prouince of *Hungary*, had ordained a publike diſputatiõ betwixt the *Caluiniſts* and the *Antitrinitarians*, that is to ſay,

those

thoſe who oppugned the myſtery of the Bleſſed Trinity, and that according to the cõmon doctrine on both ſyds, they ſhould diſpute only out of the holy Scriptures, the *Caluiniſts* could neuer proue out of the Scriptures alone, that there is eyther a ſubſtance or perſon in God, neyther could they by the Scriptures only declare what is a perſon, or what is a ſubſtance.

4. Wherefore at the laſt this was the end of the diſputatiõ, that almoſt all thoſe which were preſent iudged, that the *Antitrinitarians* got the victory, and that the *Caluiniſts* were ſhamefully ouercome: wherupon it came to paſſe that the ſayd Prince of *Tranſiluania*, of a *Caluiniſt* became an *Antitrinitarian*, yea one of their cheife friends; in ſo much that he tooke ſome publike Churches from the *Caluiniſts*, and gaue them to the *Antitrinitarians*, and he continued miſerably in that wicked hereſy euen till death, which happened in the yeare 1571. the 14. of March.

5. All which things are aboundãtly declared by one *Ioannes Sommerus Pirnenſis* in the funerall Oration which he made at his death, wherein among other things he affirmeth, that the cheife cauſe why this Prince left the *Caluiniſts*, and became an *Antitrinitarian*, was this, becauſe forſooth in the

Scri-

Scriptures he could fynd nothing of the Blessed Trinity, and for that the *Caluinists* were forced to confesse, that the words whereby the mystery of the Blessed Trinity is explicated are not extãt in the holy Scripture: but because this funeral Oration is scarse any where to be found & least some should thinke that I falsely coyned these things my selfe, I will heare set downe his owne words. For after he had most blasphemously spoken, as the *Antitrinitarians* are wont to doe, against the Blessed Trinity, the which he calleth heere and there the Roman Idolatry, these things he addeth of his Prince.

6. But this our Prince (saith he) being instructed by God, easily vnderstood what was the truth, and with earnest desire imbraced it, and with no lesse pleasure of mind defended it: for being accustomed euen from his childhood to reade the holy Scriptures, he made them very familiar vnto him, & presently he found that such things which were contrary to the phrase of Christ and his Apostles, were in the ensuing ages by a wicked curiosity brought into the Church; and that they are not at all to be numbred amongst those things which add any firmity or strength to the Author of our saluation, especially seing that

This funeral Oration of Iohn Sommer was printed at Claudiopoli an. Domini 1571.

» that the Aduersaries themselues acknow-
» ledge, that the words wherby these subtil-
» ties of this new opinion are explicated if
» not rather (as I may well say) more obscu-
» red, are not to be found in the writings of
» the Apostles.

» 7. And a little after. Wherfore little
regarding either the multitude of wran-
glers, or the torments and paines which o-
thers had endured, who first endeauored
to breake this ice, he manifestly condem-
ned the falsity of the Trinity, freely pro-
fessing his owne opinion therein. And
after a few words. For what hath he not
done? what assemblies and disputations
hath he not ordayned and caused to be had
about this matter, both in *Hungary*, and in
Transiuania, that the sense or meaning of
» the Scripture might the better be explica-
» ted by conferring those thinges together
» which were then said or spoken of, where
» he would not only be present himselfe, but
» also taking the place or office of the Iudge
» and vmpyre in the said disputations, he
» very wisely and grauely confuted the grea-
» absurdities of that superstition, warning
» often the Aduersaries, that seeking the
» fancies or fond inuentions of men, they
» should lesse impudently and more sincerely
» carry themselues in the explication of the
» heauenly

He meaneth Seruetus who was burnt at Geneua. an. 1553. as Beza writeth in vita Calu.

heauenly doctrine. Thus farre *Sommerus* of the great care & diligence of the Prince of *Transiluania* in defending the hereſy of the *Antitrinitarians*.

8. Moreouer it is alſo manifeſt that out of this opinion of our Aduerſaries, to wit, that we muſt not beleiue any thing which is not expreſſed in Scriptures, this wicked hereſy of the *Antitrinitarians* in theſe our dayes had her beginning. For that *Michael Seruetus* who in our age was the firſt of them that by printed bookes preſumed to oppugne the myſtery of the Bleſſed Trinity, doth plainely teſtify, writing in this manner: For the ſolution, ſaith he, of all things which may heere be alledged by the Philoſophers (for thus he calleth the Catholikes) thou muſt obſerue this rule, which is an axiome among lawiers, that thoſe thinges which do not deſerue any ſpeciall note or marke, are vnderſtood and eſteemed as things neglected, vnleſſe they be ſpecially noted. But I pray thee iudge, whether this article of the Trinity deſerue any ſpeciall note or no, ſeing that it is the chiefeſt and firſt ground of all our faith, wherof the whole knowledge of God and Chriſt dependeth. And whether it be expreſſely noted or no, may be ſeene by reading ouer the Scriptures, ſeing

Seruetus l. 1. de erroribus Trinitatis fol. 32. pag. 1. Edit. an. 1531.

L. Item apud §. Ait Prætor. ff. de iuriſd.

« seing that there is not one word to be foūd
« of the Trinity in the whole Bible, nor of
« the persons therof, nor of the essence or
« vnity of the suppositiō, nor of the vnity
« of nature in many distinct thinges, and
« such like. Thus farre *Seruetus*. By these it euidently appeareth that all these monstrous & strange opinions of latter *Arrians*, who are also called *Antitrinitarians* do proceed from this one principle of our Aduersaries, to wit, that we must only beleeue Scriptures, and by this they are encreased. But let vs now see other matters.

9. The second point of faith is, that Infants are to be baptized. For our Aduersaries will neuer shew this in the holy Scriptures. For that one place which doth clearly conuince this, to wit, *vnlesse he be borne againe of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God*, they wrest and expound it in another sense. For they will not haue this word (*water*) to signify the *element of water*, but the *holy Ghost*: so *Caluin*: hence arose that wicked sect of the *Anabaptistes*, who affirme now adayes that it is *an vnlawfull and prophane thing, to baptize Infants*, seing that there is no solide reason heereof extant in the Scriptures.

Ioan. 3. v. 5.

Calu. in c. 3. Ioan. v. 5

10. For that wherunto *Caluin* and his followers

followers do fly for refuge, to wit, that in the old Law Infantes were circumcised, the *Anabaptistes* do easily confute both, because cõcerning that, there was an expresse precept of God, but there was none of the baptisme of Infants; and the similitude also betwixt circumcision and baptisme doth not hold in all thinges, for otherwise women should not be baptized but only men.

Genes. 17. v. 10.

S. Aug. Tom. 6. de hæres. cap. 84.

S. Hieron. cõtra Heluidium

Author de Eccles. dogmatib. cap. 69.

S. Ambr. in Epist. 72. ad Siricium Papam.

Epiphan. hæres. 78.

Innius cõtra Bellar. Controu. 1. lib. 4. cap. 9. num. 5.

11. The third point of faith is, that the Blessed Virgin Mary the mother of God remayned alwayes a Virgin euen after her childbyrth. For this is extant no where in Scripture, and yet *Heluidius* was condemned as an Heretike by the whole auncient Church, because he presumed to deny this.

12. When *Bellarmine* had alleadged this vnwritte poynt of faith, to proue that all such pointes of faith were not expresly set downe in holy writ, *Franciscus Innius* to answere vnto this difficulty was forced to take and approue the condemned heresy of *Heluidius*. For he denyeth that we ought to belieue as a point of faith the perpetuall Virginity of our B. Lady. But the ancient Fathers had neuer condemned *Heluidius* as an Heretike vnlesse he had denyed a point of faith. But

in this manner are our Aduersaries forced to renew the old heresies of tymes past, to the end they may defend this their paradoxe, that we must only beleeue Scriptures.

CHAP. IIII.

Whether there are any pointes of faith to be alleadged, which are no where extant in the Bible.

THE fourth point that our Aduersaries also beleeue, but without expresse Scripture for it, is that Christians cannot lawfully haue more wyues at once: for the *Councell of Trent* hath very well defined this to be a point of faith against the heresy of these tymes, wherof we will speake more presently. But yet our Aduersaries can neuer proue this out of Scriptures only, abstracting from the authority of the Church, albeit they also agree with vs in the beliefe heerof. Yea the examples of holy Scripture do rather perswade the cõtrary. For those most holy men *Abraham*, *Iacob*, *Dauid*, and many others had more wyues at

Concil. Trident. sess. 24. c. 2.

at once, yet neuer did God reprehend this in them, albeit he often ſpake vnto them.

2. When *Bernardine Ochine* one of *Caluins* ſchollers did conſider this, he was not afrayd to perſwade both by word and writing, that *Polygamy* was yet lawfull, of whome and of his moſt wicked lyfe *Beza* writeth at large. *Beza Epiſt. 1. ad Andream Duditium.*

But *Ochinus* grounded only this his hereſy in that principle of our Aduerſaries before alledged, to wit, that we muſt beleiue nothing which is not expreſly in Scriptures. And whereupon *Beza* himſelf in his booke which he wrote againſt the ſame *Ochinus* doth teſtify, that *Ochinus* vſed this argument: where *Beza* alſo manifeſtly acknowledgeth that *Polygamy* is not forbidden in holy Scriptures by any expreſſe Law. *The other argument* (ſaith *Beza*) *of Ochinus, is that Polygamy is not forbidden by any expreſſe law to the contrary: but I anſwere, that there are not lawes written of all thinges.* Thus *Beza*. *Beza in lib. de Poligamia. extat. in initio voluminis 2. ſuarum Tract. Theol.*

3. But afterward indeed *Beza* goeth about to proue that *Poligamy* is contrary to the *Law* of *Nature*, but the ſame difficulty ſtill remayneth. For according to our Aduerſaries doctrine all thinges neceſſary to ſaluation are expreſſed in holy Scriptures: but the obſeruatiō of all things

belonging to the *Law of Nature*, is altogether neceſſary to ſaluation, therefore the obſeruation of theſe thinges is expreſſed in Scriptures, or els truly many thinges neceſſary to ſaluation muſt be ſought for out of the Scriptures. Moreouer that *Polygamy* is vnlawfull, is a point of faith, but this as *Beza* confeſſeth is not expreſſely contayned in Scriptures, therfore all the pointes of faith are not expreſſely contained in Scriptures.

4. The firſt point of faith is, that the Sacrament of *Baptiſme* may only be giuen in water. For this point is alſo very neceſſary for the Church, leaſt ſo great and worthy a Sacrament be prophaned, contrary to the inſtitution of Chriſt: and yet our Aduerſaries will neuer be able to proue this out of the Scriptures only, who deny that the forſaid place of S. *Iohn* is to be vnderſtood of true water, as we haue ſaid before in the ſecond point. For the examples of holy Scripture do proue indeed that water is the fit matter of *Baptiſme*, but they do not proue that there can be no other matter.

§. 2. cap. præced. Beza Epiſt. 2. ad Tom. Tilium Fratrem & Symmiſtam ſuam.

5. When *Beza* did conſider this well, leaſt that his foreſayd principle that we muſt beleeue nothing but Scripture might ſeeme to be called in queſtion, he was not

aſhamed

aſhamed to write that *Baptiſme* might be giuen in any liquour, and by this meanes it wilbe true and lawfull *Baptiſme*, though it be giuen in milke, wyne, yea in Inke or any other filthy liquour. Thus are our Aduerſaryes forced to admit theſe abſurditeyes, leaſt they might be forced to depart from that their principle of believing only Scripture.

6. Furthermore to the end that *Beza* might more eaſily perſwade the ignorant common people to admit this his ſtrange paradoxe, addeth preſently a very grieuous ſlaunder againſt the Catholike Doctors. *Let water be wanting*, ſaith, Beza, *and yet the* Baptiſme *of any cannot be deferred with edification, nor muſt not be, I truly would as well and as lawfully baptize in any other liquour as in water: neyther are the moſt ſuperſtitious Deuines of any other opinion in theſe matters*. Thus far *Beza*. But theſe thinges which he writeth are moſt falſe. For there is no Catholike nor Scholaſticall Doctor who hath euer eyther thought or written ſo, yea the playne contrary is defined by the Catholike Church as a poynt of Fayth.

Beza addē *Epiſt.* 2.

Concil. Trid. ſeſſ. 7. *can.* 2. *de baptiſmo.*

7. The ſixt poynt of fayth, is that bread and wyne is only the neceſſary matter of the Bleſſed Sacrament of the Euchariſt,

rift. This poynt of faith is alſo very neceſſary for the Church, leaſt ſo great and ſo excellent a Sacrament ſhould be prophaned; yet our Aduerſaries will neuer be able to proue it effectually out of Scripture only. For by this word (*Bread*) any kind of meate is oftentymes ſignifyed in Scripture; of *wine* it is farre more doubtfull. For the Scripture maketh only mention of the *Chalice*, and not of the liquor which was in the *Chalice*; and *Caluin* himſelfe acknowledgeth that thoſe words (*of the fruite of the vyne*) were ſpoken before the inſtitution of this Sacrament.

Luc. 22. v. 18.
Calu. ibid. in ſua harmonia.

8. The which when *Beza* eaſily preceaued, heere alſo he went about to bring in another error, leaſt indeed he ſhould be forced to forſake his former principle of believing only Scriptures. For he was not afraid to write that he erred nothing from the inſtitution of Chriſt, who in the conſecration of the Euchariſt ſhould vſe inſteed of the bread appointed for that purpoſe, any other vſuall meate, and inſteed of the wyne any other ordinary kind of drinke, and by this meanes one may conſecrate the Euchariſt eyther in cheeſe, fleſh, fiſh, or egges, as alſo in milke, water, beare, or vineger, or any other liquor

Beza Epiſt. 2. citata.

which

which hitherto was neuer heard of in Gods Church. And yet for all this *Bellar.* is not ashamed to attribute this most absurd error of his to all *the Scholastical Doctors*. For of both these errors he treateth in the words before alledged, because when he sayth *the Scholastical Doctors* were of no other opinion, he speaketh as well cõcerning the matter of the *Eucharist*, as of the matter of *Baptisme*. After this manner our Aduersaries do force so many and so great errors out of that their principle of beleiuing only Scriptures, wherof more might be alledged, which for breuities sake we omit.

9. But there is one thing I cannot let passe, because therby we clearly cõuince that the *Traditions* of the Church do not only contayne vnwritten points of fayth, but (that which is more) euen in our Aduersaries iudgment they change and abolish such things as are expresly commaunded in Scriptures: for euen in the Table of the Law of God, which is sayd to be written by Gods owne hand, in many and manyfest words the keeping of the *Sabboth* day is comaunded, the which notwithstanding, now all, except a few *Anabaptists*, do confesse to be abrogated by *Ecclesiastical Tradition* only, without any expresse

Exod. 34. v. 1. *Exod.* 20. v. 8. 9. 10. 11.

preſſe teſtimony of Scripture. The *Anabaptiſts* I ſay being alſo deceiued by that Common principle of our Aduerſaries of blieuing only Scriptures, they go about to bring the obſeruation of the Sabboth day into vſe and cuſtome agayne, and for this cauſe they are called *Sabatharians*, but not ſo much the hereſy as the madneſſe of theſe men is condemned of all, and namely of *Luther* in his booke againſt the *Sabbatarians*, in the ſeuenth Tome.

Vide Prateolum V. Sabatharij.

CHAP. V.

Wherin it is proued, that there are Traditions by the teſtimonies of the holy Fathers.

THE third argument wherby we proue, that all the poynts of our fayth are not ſet downe in writing by the Apoſtles, is the authority of the aunciẽt Fathers, who affirme and teach this in many places. The which places of the holy Fathers, as well the Greekes as the Latins *Iodocus Coccius* hath very diligently gathered togeather in his booke, intitled *Theſaurus Catholicus*, and before him *Bellarmine* did the ſame. But leaſt we

Coccius Tom. 1. l. 6. Antic. vltimo. Bellarm. Tom. 1. l. 4. de verbo Dei c. 7.

we be longer then the order of Epitomes doth permit, eſpecially in a thing ſo manyfeſt, it ſhall ſuffice vs to alledg one chiefe Doctor of the Greeke, and another of the Latine Church.

2. Among the *Grecians S. Chryſoſtome* is the moſt famous, who doth not only affirme it but alſo manifeſtly proueth it out of holy Scripture. For when he expoundeth thoſe words of the later Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians: *Therefore brethren ſtand and hold the Traditions which you haue learned, whether it be by word or by our Epiſtle*, he writeth thus: *Hence it appeareth*, ſayth *S. Chryſoſtome, that he did not deliuer all things vnto them by his Epiſtle but many things alſo without his letters, but as well theſe, as thoſe other, worthily deſerue to be believed; therfore we eſteeme the Tradition alſo of the Church to be worthy of credit. It is a Tradition, ſeeke no further.* Thus *S. Chryſoſtome*. But it is moſt certayne that the *Apoſtle* and conſequently *S. Chryſoſtome* alſo, who expoūdeth him, doth not only ſpeake of ceremonies and cuſtomes, but alſo of poynts of Fayth.

2. ad Theſ. c. 1. v. 14.

S. Chriſoſt. Hom. 4. in 2. ad Theſſal.

Caluin l. 4. Inſtit c. 14. ſect. vlt.

3. *S. Auguſtine* whom *Caluin* acknowledgeth to be the *beſt* and *moſt faythfull witneſſe of antiquity*, writeth in this manner. *Many things are not to be found in the Apoſtles writings, nor in the enſewing Councells, and yet not*

S. Auguſt. Tom. 7. de baptiſmo. contra Donatiſt. l. 2. cap. 7.

withſtanding, becauſe they are generally kept throughout the whole Catholike Church; they are iuged to haue byn deliuered and commended by none, but by them. Thus S. *Auguſtine*. Neyther can it be ſayd, that S. *Auguſtine* ſpeaketh of ceremonies and not of poynts of fayth. For in that place he proueth againſt the *Donatiſts* that thoſe which were baptized in the accuſtomed forme and matter by heretikes were not to be baptized againe, but none vnleſſe he be an *Anabaptiſt*, will deny that this is a point of fayth.

CHAP. VI.

Wherin euen by the doctrine of our Aduerſaries it is proued, that there are Traditions.

THE fourth argument wherby we proue *Traditions*, is taken out of the doctrine of our Aduerſaries. For all thoſe things which our Aduerſaries do affirme to be poyntes of fayth againſt the Catholike doctrine, they teach and beliue them without any expreſſe Scripture. For it cannot be found expreſſely in Scripture, that *fayth only iuſtifyeth*, that there are only two *Sacraments* of the

the new law, *that none should pray for the dead &c.* for all these things and many others which they teach against vs, they gather only out of Scriptures, and that by some false and very weake consequence; but it is no where expressly written, that fayth only iustifieth, that there are only two Sacraments, that we must not pray to Saynts or for the dead &c.

2. Moreouer there can no Catholike be found who doth not receaue and assuredly beleeue the whole authenticall text of the holy Scripture, why do they therfore condemne vs, when they affirme that nothing is to be beleeued besids the text of Scripture, whereas the whole Controuersy betwixt them and vs, is of the vnwritten poines of fayth which, we affirme, & they deny?

3. Our Aduersaries being conuinced by this argument, do now at the last confesse, that not only that is to be admitted and beleeued as the pure word of God which is expressly written in holy Scripture, but all that also which by a necessary consequence may be gathered out of it. *Beza de notis Eccl. pag. 137. volum. 2. Theol. Tract. edit. ann. 1581.*

4. But when they answere thus, they are forced to depart and forsake that their first principle, wherby they affirmed that all

all the poynts of fayth are expresly conteyned in Scriptures, and that they were set downe in writing by the Apostles.

5. Furhermore not perceauing so much, they ioyne in opinion with vs, so that they must needes indeed confesse that the *Traditions* of the Church are altogeather necessary. For such things as are gathered out of Scriptures do rather belong to *Traditions* then to expresse Scripture. For that which only, consequently, & by reasoning & discoursing is gathered out of Scripture albeit it very well and necessarily may be deduced from thence, is not expressely in Scripture, but only obscurly, *secretly*, or virtually is conteined therin. For no man can truly say, that the conclusion which is only inferred out of the premisses is expresly conteyned in the same premisses, for otherwise our discourse and arguing were vayne and to no purpose. But therfore do we reason and discourse to the end, that that which lyeth hidden virtually in the premisses may be expresly manyfested in the conclusion.

6. And that we may alleadge an example out of the Scriptures themselues, when God the Father sayd, *This is my welbeloued Sonne, heare him*. Out of these wordes

Matt. 17. v. 5.

we

we may very well gather, and by a neceſſary conſequence, that the whole doctrine of Chriſt our Lord is to be heard and receiued of all: yet none will ſay, that all the doctrine of Chriſt is conteyned expreſſly in thoſe few wordes. And truely the holy Scripture is ſo fertill & plentifull that many pointes of faith do as yet lye hidden and vnknowne therin, which hitherto hath neuer byn gathered togeather by any, but theſe thinges are conteyned virtually and not expreſſely in it.

7. Moreouer after ſo many debates and contentions, after ſo many bookes ſet forth againſt vs, after ſo many ſlaunders wherby our Aduerſaries charge vs; as though we taught that the Scriptures are imperfect, they at the laſt returne to our opinion: For we do not deny, yea we willingly acknowledge, that all thoſe things which rightly and without errour are deduced or gathered out of the expreſſe wordes of the holy Scriptures, do belong vnto the written word of God, and are contayned in holy writ obſcurely, not expreſſely, virtually, and not plainly. For in that God doth reueale any thing in expreſſe wordes, conſequently, and virtually he reuealeth all things which neceſſarily and without any errour may be deduced

from

from thence.

8. We graunt also that the Scripture consequently, mediatly, & virtually, as in a generall principle conteyneth all things necessary to saluatiō, yea in that one only article of the Creed, *I believe the holy Catholike Church*, in those few words also of Christ, *Luc. 10. v. 16.* *he who heareth you, heareth me*, if the collection be rightly framed, as we haue also said before in the 25. Chapter. But when these thinges are gathered togeather which are not expresely in Scripture, there is scarse any of them which is not vncertayne & doubtful without the authority and *Traditions* of the *Church*. Wherefore these collections do manifestly conuince the necessity and authority of *Traditions*.

9. But that these collections may be vncertayne and deceytfull, both experiēce & reasō teacheth vs: experiēce, because almost all Heresies haue had their beginning not from the Scripture alone in it selfe, but from these collections badly framed and made. For there is not almost any one heresy which is only grounded on the expresse wordes of Scripture without some other collection, seing that almost all Heretikes both in tymes past as now also go about to proue and gather their heresies from the Scripture by certayn

tayne deceytfull & ſophiſticall argumẽts. *Arius* for example, out of thoſe wordes of Chriſt; *the Father is greater then I*, did gather but badly, that Chriſt euen according to his diuine Nature was interiour to his Father. The new *Arians* out of thoſe words of the ten cõmaũdemẽts, *thou ſhalt not haue ſtrãge Gods before me*, do gather but foolishly that the Sõne is not God, the holy Ghoſt is not God. So the Diuell himſelf againſt Chriſt vſed this reaſon, *It is written, God hath giuen his Angells charge of thee*, therfore caſt thy ſelfe downe headlong. Laſtly all the argumẽts indeed which our Aduerſaries at this tyme alleadge againſt vs out of Scriptures, and all the errours which they haue inuẽted, do take their beginning and ſtrength from their new illations and reaſons, and not out of the bare and playne words of Scripture, as will manifeſtly appeare in euery one of the Controuerſies.

Ioan. 14. v. 28.

Exod. 20. v. 3.

Matth. 4. v. 6.

10. The reaſon alſo is manifeſt why theſe their collections and reaſons are vncertaine and doubtfull. For in nothing can one more eaſily or more often erre, then in theſe illations. The which may proceed of many cauſes; eyther becauſe the illation it ſelfe is bad and Sophiſticall, or becauſe the place of Scripture from whence it is gathered is falſi-

falsified by some false exposition therof, or because the proposition which is assumed and adioyned to the wordes of Scripture is false and ambiguous, or because one or more wordes in that collection are vsed doubtfully, that is to say, in one sense in the premises, and in another in the conclusion; or lastly because there hapneth some errour to be in the collection which maketh it weake, Sophisticall, and erroneous.

11. Besides that, there are so many and so contrary illations of diuers men, that the authority of the Church is altogether necessary in matters of faith, that there may arise a certaine and an vndoubted faith of these matters, of which sort Traditions are, that is to say, the doctrine of the whole Church.

12. But when one believeth such an illation with a diuine or Catholike faith, he must needes know two thinges, the one is, that the expresse place of Scripture from whence this conclusion is deduced must certainly be well vnderstood by him which disputeth: the other is, that he who maketh such a deduction and collection can neyther deceiue others nor be deceyued himselfe. But none can know eyther of these without the *Tradition* of

the Church, seeing that otherwise there is none which may not be deceiued sometymes: All collections therefore which produce or breed fayth in vs, do most clearly conuince and shew the authority and necessity of Traditions.

CHAP. VII.

Wherein it is proued, that there are Traditions, by the absurdities which otherwise would follow.

THE fift argument wherby we proue, that many things are to be believed which are not expressed in holy Scriptures, is taken out of the absurdities which do ensue of the contrary doctrine. For hauing once admitted, that nothing is to be believed which is not expressed in Scripture, all old heresies are renewed, and a great vncertaynty and confusion of all things is brought into the Church of God, yea euen the way to *Atheisme* is layd open, because hauing once reiected & despised the Tradition of the Church, all the poynts of fayth from the Apostles tyme till now explicated and proued by the auncient

Fathers against heretiks, all those things also which were decreed and determined by all the generall Councells in times past against the said heretiks, leese their chiefest strength and authority; the which notwithstanding our Aduersaries do acknowledge themselues to receiue and believe.

2. Neyther do we know by an allured Catholike fayth, whether there were euer any *Fathers or Councells* but by the *Traditions* of the Church. But neyther do we know any other way but by fayth, whether since the Apostles tyme till now there were any Catholikes or noe? because of those things which were done since the tyme and death of the Apostles, there is nothing extant in holy Scripture, seeing that all the bookes therof were written before the death of the Apostles. But such things as haue byn donne since till now, cannot otherwyse be knowne but by the Tradition of the Church.

3. Neyther is it sufficient to say, that we know these things by the Ecclesiasticall histories. For that fayth which proceedeth of histories without the authority or *Traditions* of the *Catholike Church*, is but an humaine fayth which oftentymes deceaueth others, and may be deceiued it selfe; and therfore these kind of histories

cannot

cannot produce a diuine fayth in vs: this experience it ſelfe doth clearly teach vs. For our Aduerſaries do ſomtymes doubt whether *S. Peter* was euer at *Rome*, or no, becauſe forſooth this is not to be found expreſly in holy Scriptures, wheras notwithſtanding it is moſt aſſuredly proued and teſtified in many bookes both of the auncient Hiſtoriographers and holy Fathers: Why may they not as lawfully call other matters in queſtion which are notwithſtanding expreſſely ſet downe in other auncient writers. Our Aduerſaries therfore do make all things very doubtfull and vncertayne, whyles they will only beleiue and admit the Scripture: but now let vs anſwere their arguments.

CHAP. VIII.

Wherein the arguments of our Aduerſaries, taken out of the old Teſtament, are confuted.

THE firſt argument wherby our Aduerſaries oppugne *Traditions*, and which they vſe very often, the which alſo as inuincible they haue added to the confeſſion of their fayth, they take out of thoſe words of *Deuteronomy*, *Thou ſhalt not add any thing to the word which I ſpeake vnto you; nor ſhall you take any thing from it.* And againe, *that which I commaund thee do that only; neyther add or diminiſh any thing from it.* By theſe places of Scriptures our Aduerſaries do inferre, that nothing is to be receiued as a poynt of fayth, which is not expreſſely ſet downe in Scriptures.

Rupellana confeſſio Artic. 5.
Deuter. 4. v. 2.
Deut. 12. v. vltimo.

2. But this argument is erroneous and the weaknes thereof is very great for many cauſes. Firſt becauſe in thoſe words there is no mention made of the Scripture nor of the written word of God, but only of the word preached and deliuered *viua voce*. *Thou ſhalt not add* (ſayth the Scripture) *to the word that I ſpeake vnto you*, he doth not ſay

ſay, that I write vnto you. Againe, Do only ſayth he, that which I commaund thee, he doth not ſay, that which I write vnto thee.

3. Moreouer in theſe words the holy Scripture doth not only ſpeake of matters of fayth to be belieued, but alſo of ceremonies and cuſtomes to be done and obſerued: but our Aduerſaries themſelues confeſſe, that theſe cuſtomes may be added by the authority of the Church, yea they haue ordeined themſelues very many, the which they chang euen yet when they pleaſe. *Caluin* alſo acknowledgeth that many vnwritten cuſtomes were deliuered vnto vs by the Apoſtles. *Caluin cō-tra 4. ſeſſ. Concil. Trident.*

4. That alſo according to the phraſe of Scripture is ſaid to be added to the word of God which is contrary & oppoſite vnit. For *Ioſue* did not tranſgreſſe this commaundement of *Deuteronomy*, when he added his booke to the bookes of *Moyſes*. Nor did others tranſgreſſe it who added the bookes of the *Iudges*, *Ruth*, and of the *Kinges*, which were not written by *Moyſes*, & which are alſo to be belieued as contayning pointes of faith. But in theſe bookes there is nothing contrary to that which *Moyſes* wrote. And the Hebrew text agreeth very well to this anſwere, for in both

places of *Deuteronomy* this word (*Ghal*) is vſed, which ſignifieth oftentimes *contrary*, or *againſt*, ſo that the ſenſe is, do not add any thing contrary to the word which I commaund: and againe, yee ſhall not add any thing contrary to the word which I ſay vnto you. For ſo is that particle (*Ghal*) taken in the 40. *Pſalme* (or according to the Hebrewes 41. in the 2. Pſalme alſo, the ſecond verſe. And in the 14. of Numbers the 2. verſe, & els where very often. Euen as alſo in the new Teſtament ἐναντίος, which anſwereth to the Hebrew *Ghal*, ſignifieth alſo *contrary*, or againſt; when the Apoſtle writeth to the Corinthians, *that in vs you may learne one not to be puffed vp againſt another aboue that is written*. that is to ſay, againſt the Scripture, the which ſaith, we muſt not be puffed vp in pryde as S. *Chryſoſtome*, and after him *Theophilactus* & others do note vpon that place. The which place ſome bodily alledge againſt *Traditions*, wheras the Apoſtle in that place doth not ſpeake of the whole word of God, but of this one point, that we muſt not be puffed vp in pryde, as euen *Caluin* himſelfe acknowledgeth.

2. ad Cor. 4. v. 6.

Caluin. in illa verba 1. ad Corin. 4. v. 6.

5. But to omit all ſuch thinges as other Catholike Doctors haue very well, and learnedly written of the proper and literall

literall ſenſe of theſe wordes, yea that we may alſo graunt to our Aduerſaries that this which they alledge is the true ſenſe, they erre very much in that they thinke that theſe wordes of *Moyſes* belong vnto vs, and that we are no leſſe now bound and obliged by them, then the *Iewes* were in tymes paſt. For theſe wordes do no more appertaine vnto vs then thoſe of the ſame booke of *Deuteronomy*. *Curſed be he that abideth not in the wordes of this Law, and fulfilleth them not in worke.* From which wordes *S. Paul* manifeſtly teacheth that we are deliuered and freed, *by the grace of Chriſt Ieſus*. But ſeing that in theſe wordes which they do heere alledge *Moyſes* commaundeth that the Childrē of *Iſrael* ſhould obſerue & fulfill euery word which he had commaunded them, for ſo it is expreſly ſet downe *Deuteronomy* 12. *the laſt verſe*, in the Hebrew text, and in all the *Bibles* of our Aduerſaries, and he preſently addeth that nothing is to be added or detracted from all theſe, he manifeſtly commaundeth the keeping of the whole *Moyſaicall Law*, and of all the Sacraments, Sacrifices, and Ceremonies of the old Teſtament. For he doth not only commaund, that nothing ſhould be added but alſo that nothing is to be detracted of all thoſe thinges by him commaū-

Deuteron. 27. v. vlt.

Ad Galat. 3. v. 10. & 13.

ded. Wherefore if our Aduerſaries obiect againſt vs that we adde any thing againſt this precept, we may more iuſtly obiect vnto them, that they detract farre more then we add, ſeing that they neyther obſerue the *Circumciſion*, nor the *legall Sacrifices*, nor other Ceremonies which are ſo often and ſo ſtraitely commaunded in *Deuteronomy*. It cannot truly be denyed, but that this is to detract ſomewhat from thoſe thinges which *Moyſes* commaunded; and therfore our Aduerſaries muſt needes confeſſe that theſe are the wordes of the old Law, and conſequently to appertaine nothing vnto vs. Out of this which hath byn ſaid, it followeth, that our Aduerſaries do very indiſcretly & fooliſhly boaſt and bragge of thoſe wordes of *Moyſes*. For in the expoſition, thereof they erre farre from the truth, and a great deale more in the application, when they go about to proue that we are alſo bound and obliged by them.

6. Our Aduerſaries take their ſecond argument out of theſe wordes of *Salomons* prouerbs: *Euery word of God is fiery, it is a shyeld of defence to thoſe which hope in it: do not add any thing to the wordes thereof, and thou shalt be found and reprehended as a lyar*. I anſwere that this place maketh nothing againſt vs: for in that

Prouerb. 30. v. 5. & 6.

that place there is no mention made of Scripture only, but of al the word of God. And it is moſt true that nothing ſhould be added to all the whole word of God, the which is to be believed with a Catholike faith as the true word of God. For as we haue ſaid before, our faith relyeth only of the word of God, but the Scripture only is not all the word of God, becauſe all *Traditions* alſo which contayne poynts of faith belong therunto, as we haue ſufficiently proued already. But they add to the word of God, & are lyars who affirme that God ſayd this, or that, which indeed he neuer ſpake. And of this ſort are thoſe falſe Prophets, of whome God by the Prophet *Ieremy* conplayneth, ſaying, *They ſpeake the viſion of their hartes, not from the mouth of our Lord:* & againe, *I did not ſpeake vnto them, and they did propheſy.* This place alſo may very well be vnderſtood, of thoſe who add any thing contrary to the word of God. For in the Hebrew text, there is ſet downe that particle (*Ghal*) which oftentymes ſignifieth *contrary*, or *againſt*, as we haue already declared in our anſwere to the firſt argument.

Supra. 2.

Hier. 23. *v.* 16. *&* 25.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Wherin is examined that place of S. Paul *Epiſtle to the Galathians, the which our Aduerſaries do obiect againſt Traditions.*

Confeſſ. Rupell. Art. 3.

THE third argument our Aduerſaries take out of the firſt Chapter to the *Galathians*, the which they haue alſo added to their confeſſion of fayth as inuincible. For they haue omitted their ſecond argument as not ſtrong inough for their purpoſe. But thus they frame their argument: The Apoſtle ſayth twice an *Anathema* to thoſe who teach any thing beſids that which he hath taught: therefore nothing is to be receiued or belieued but Scripture. Our Aduerſaries haue this place of the Apoſtle often in their mouthes, wherefore it ſhalbe examined more exactly. We anſwere therfore that our Aduerſaries do erre heere for two reaſons, firſt becauſe our whole controuerſy is of the written word of God, but in theſe words there is no mention made of the writtē word, or of Scripture, but only of the word preached and deliue-

Gal. 1. v. 8. & 9.

red

red *viua voce* to the *Galathians* by *S. Paul.* And hence it is that *S. Auguſtine* farre otherwiſe then our Aduerſaries, diſputing againſt the *Donatiſts* proueth by theſe words of the Apoſtle, that we are bound to admit and belieue the Traditions of the Church: as for exãple, that thoſe who are once orderly and lawfully chriſtened by *Heretiks*, are not to be baptized againe. And well truly; for that which is *viua voce* deliuered, is a *Tradition*, and not Scripture. Moreouer if the Scripture only conteyned expreſſely all the poynts of fayth, the Apoſtle would rather haue propoſed the Scripture as the rule of faith then his owne preaching, ſeing that the Scripture is manifeſtly well knowne to all Nations, but his owne preaching to the *Galathians* only. But our Aduerſaries vrge againe and ſay, that all that which the Apoſtle preached to the *Galathians* was written eyther before that tyme or afterward by *S. Paul* and the other Apoſtles: they ſay this, but they proue it not. For this is no where written in holy Scripture, and ſo whyles they goe about to perſwade vs, that all poinſts of fayth are writtẽ, they coyne & inuent a new point, which is no where extant in Scripture, that is to ſay, that all ſuch things as *S. Paul, viua voce* taught the *Galathians*, are written.

S. Auguſt. Tom. 7. de vnit. Eccleſ. c. 24.

But

S. Aug. Tom. 9. Tract. 96. in Ioan & Tom. 7. de vnitat. Eccles. c. 21. in fine.

But we following herein *S. Augustine*, do gather much better by these words, and infer thus against them. If there must be nothing believed, but that which *S. Paul* preached to the *Galathians*, and that none knoweth certainly what are those things which he preached, but by the *Traditions* and doctrine of the Church, it followeth manifestly that besids the Scripture we must also believe the *Traditions* and *doctrine* of the Church; seing that without them we cannot certainly and without errour know what were those things which the *Apostle* taught the *Galathians*.

2. Secondly our Aduersaries do erre in that they doe not rightly expound that particle in the wordes of S. *Paul* (*prater*) (*besides*) but rather contrary to the Apostles meaning. For the Latine word *prater*, as also the *Greeke* word παρὰ, and the Hebrew (*Ghal*) haue two significations. In the former it signifyeth all that which is not the selfe same thing whereof we doe speake: in the later sense it signifieth that only which is contrary to that we speake of. In which sense *prater* signifieth the same that *contra*, doth, to wit (*against:*) the former sense is manifest inough, the later is proued by these places of Scripture, *Act.* 18. v. 13.

where

where all do tranſlate theſe Greeke words, παρὰ τὸν νόμον, to be againſt the Law: ſo hath not only the vulgar edition, but alſo *Calvin* and *Beza*, and all the French *Bibles* of *Geneua*. Likewiſe in the firſt to the Romans the 26. *verſ.* παρὰ φύσιν ſignifieth againſt Nature: ſo hath the vulgar edition and all the french *Bibles* of *Genena*, yea *Cicero*, as witneſſeth *Henricus Stephanus* doth thus tranſlate this phraſe out of Greeke. Againe in the 4. to the *Romanes* the 18. *verſe*, παρὰ ſignifieth *againſt*, as the vulgar edition, and *Beza* hath in all editions. Moreouer in the 11. to the *Romans* the 24. *verſ.* παρὰ ſignifieth *againſt*, as the vulgar edition and all the *Bibles* of *Geneua* haue: finally in the laſt to the *Romans* the 17. *verſ.* aſwell the Greeke word παρὰ, as the Latin word (*præter*) in our interpretor ſignifieth the ſame thing that *contra* doth, as manifeſtly appeareth by the precedent wordes, for diſſenſions, and ſcandals are contrary or againſt the doctrine of Chriſt, and not only beſides his doctrine. Wherfore *Calvin* in his *Commentaries* ſet forth in the yeare 1557. vpon the Epiſtle to the *Romanes*, and *Sebaſtian Caſtalio*, and all the *French* Bibles of *Geneua* haue *contrary* or againſt the doctrine: and albeit *Beza* tranſlateth it beſide the doctrine, yet in his

Calu. ſuper acta Ap poſt. ann. 1560. Beza edit. an. 1560. & 1565. & 1598. Henric. Steph. in theſauro linguæ Græcæ Tom. 2. in dictione παρὰ.

his laſt edition ſet forth in the yeare 1597. he tranſlateth it *contrary to the doctrine* and in his Annotations he warneth that it is rather ſo to be tranſlated. It is not therfore ſtrange or abſurd that the Greeke word παρα, or the Latyne *preter* ſhould ſignify the ſame that *contra* doth.

3. But now that this word may not only be thus vſed, but that alſo it muſt neceſſarily be ſo vnderſtood and taken in this place, we haue ſhewed by the abſurdities which would otherwiſe follow. The firſt is that *S. Paul* would haue ſayd *Anathema* to *S. Iohn Euangeliſt*, who many yeares after the preaching of *S. Paul* to the *Galathians*, yea after his death, wrote his *Apocalyps*, wherein there are many new reuelations which *S. Paul* had not preached to the *Galathians*, becauſe they were not then reuealed by God.

4. The ſecond abſurdity, that *S. Paul* had pronoūced an *Anathema* vpon all thoſe who in his tyme by a prophetical ſpirit did dayly prophesy new things. For in the Apoſtles tyme there were many ſuch as appeareth by the firſt epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. And *S. Paul* could not preach to the *Galathians*, which God had not yet reuealed.

1. *ad Cor.* 14. v. 2. 4. 26. & 30.

5. The third abſurdity, the Apoſtle for

for the ſame reaſon had pronounced *Anathema* againſt S. *Luke* who in the *Acts* of the Apoſtles relateth many thinges which happened long after S. *Paul* left *Galatia*.

6. The fourth abſurdity, the Apoſtle for the ſame cauſe alſo had condemned himſelfe with the ſaid *Anathema*. For he wrote many Epiſtles after he had left *Galatia*, wherein he relateth many thinges which hapned afterward vnto him eyther at *Rome*, or in other places.

7. Laſtly it is an abſurd thing to think either God after thoſe wordes of S. *Paul* to the *Galathians* could reueale to men nothing more by an Angell ſent from heauen, or that the ſaid Angell who by the commaundement of God ſhould reueale any new thing, but not contrary to faith, ſhould incurre that *Anathema* by S. *Paul*, ſeing that this were to wreſt the *Anathema* vpon God himſelfe, who commaunded the Angell to do ſo. This place therfore cannot be vnderſtood of diuers and diſtinct thinges from thoſe which S. *Paul* taught the *Galathians*, but only of contrary and oppoſite thinges vnto them. But according to this ſenſe of the word (*preter*) all the foreſayd Abſurdities doe ceaſe. For neyther S. *Iohn* in his *Apocalyps*, nor

S. Luke in the *Actes of the Apoſtles*, nor any other which did prophecy, nor S. Paul himſelf, euer wrote or taught any thing contrary to that which S. Paul taught the Galathians. But euen God himſelf cannot reueale the contrary by an Angell, becauſe according to the Apoſtle, It is impoſſible for God to lye.

Ad Hebr. 16. v. 18.

8. Neyther is it ſufficient for me to ſay that thoſe thinges which were afterward reuealed and written, were not neceſſary pointes of faith to ſaluation. For S. Paul did not ſay, if any ſhall Euangelize vnto you any point neceſſary to ſaluation: but, abſolutely, if any ſhall Euangelize any thing *contrary* to that which you haue receyued. Moreouer all theſe thinges which were afterward ſet downe in holy Scripture were true pointes of faith, the which euery Chriſtiã is neceſſarily boũd to beliue, if not expreſſely, yet at the leaſt virtually and generally euery one is boũd to beliue with an aſſured faith all thoſe things which are in holy Writ to be moſt certaine and true.

9. Finally euen our Aduerſaries confeſſion doth conuince this to be moſt true, for now they acknowledge that all thoſe thinges which by a neceſſary conſequẽs are deduced out of the Scriptures do belong

long vnto the word of God and are points of fayth, and therfore they may be lawfully preached vnto the people as we haue said before. But al these are distinct things from those which are expressly written in holy Scriptures. For the antecedent wherby some other thing may be inferred, is distinct from that which is inferred. For it were a ridiculous illation if one and the same thing should be inferred from it selfe. But that which is inferred in a good collection is neuer contrary to the antecedent. The Apostle therefore speaketh of doctrine contrary to his, and not absolutly of any other distinct doctrine.

Suprac. 32.

10. And in this sense the Fathers doe often say that *S. Paul* affirmed in this place that nothing was to be taught besids that which is in the holy Scripture. For so *S. Augustine* speaketh in one place. But in another he clearly explicateth himselfe by this word (*præter*) to vnderstand (*contra*) because we must preach nothing contrary to the holy Scripture. That this is the true sense and meaning of *S. Augustine*, it is manifest by the words themselues, wherby also he proueth that the word (*præter*) in those words of the Apostle, doth signify diuers, but not contrary thinges. For in

S. August. Tom. 7. cõtra literas Petil. Donatist. lib 3. cap. 6. S. August. Tom. 9. Tract. 98. in Euang. Ioan. sub finem.

this manner he writeth when he warneth his scholers to take heed of the opinions of the *Manicheans* & other heretikes, because these are not only distinct but also contrary to those which the Apostles taught. *Let the admonition*, sayth he, *of the holy Apostle neuer depart from your hart. If any shall Euangelize vnto you besids that which you haue receiued, let him be an Anathema. He doth not say more, then you haue receaued, but besides that which you haue receaued. For if he should say that, he should be preiudiciall to himselfe who coueteth to come to the Thessalonians, that he might supply that which was wanting to their sayth. Now he which supplieth addeth that which is lacking, taketh not away that which was. But he which ouerpassethly the rule of sayth doth not goe on in the way, but departeth frō the way. That therfore which our Lord sayth, I haue yet many things to say vnto you, but you cannot beare them now, were to be added to those things which they knew, and not to be ouerthrowen by those they had alreadi learned. Hitherto S. Augustine.*

Ad Gal. 1. v. 9.

1. ad Thess. 3. v. 10.

Ioan. 16. v. 12.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Wherein other obiections of our Aduersaries against Traditions are refuted.

THE fourth argument is deduced out of those words of the *Apocalyps* which they also cite and alledge in their confessiō at *Rochell*. *If any man shall adde to these things, God shall adde vpon him the plagues written in this booke.* But who doth not see that *S. Iohn* speaketh expressly of the booke of the *Apocalyps* only, and not of the whole Scripture, for he sayth, *I testify to euery one hearing the words of the Prophesy of this booke, if any man shall adde to these things &c.* and in the 19. verse following. *If any man shall diminish of the words of the booke of this prophecy &c.* he speaketh therfore only of the propheticall words of the *Apocalyps*. For it is manyfest otherwise out of Eccleſiasticall histories, that *S. Iohn* wrote his Ghospell after the *Apocalyps*, and consequently that he added many things besids the *Apocalyps*. But let our Aduersaries take heed least they incurre those paynes which *S. Iohn* threatneth to those which adde

Apoc. vlt. v. 18. confess. Rupell. Artic. 5.

S. Hier. de script. Eccles. in loc. Apost.

adde or detract any thing from the *Apocalyps*; seing that they so often and so boldly wrest the prophesies of the *Apocalyps* to many strange senses against the Pope and the Catholike Church.

2. Our Aduersaries alledge many other things, but their arguments which be of lesse moment are taken out of those places of Scripture which commend vnto vs the great excellency of holy Scripture. But all these are very easily confuted by that one ground, which as we haue declared before euen our Aduersaries do admit, to wit, that to the end the holy Scripture be perfect in it selfe and sufficient to euerlasting saluation, it is not necessary that it should expresly cõteyne al points of fayth, but it is sufficiẽt, that all such poynts may be deduced by a good consequence out of it. But all the Traditions of the Church which belong vnto fayth may be gathered as we haue sayd out of Scripture, the which also we declare more at large in euery one of these controuersies. Our Aduersaries therfore haue not reason to say that we teach the Scripture to be imperfect or insufficient. For as concerning this sufficiency and perfectiõ of Scripture they are forced at least to yield and subscribe vnto our opinion herein: but these

Supra c. 25.

Supra c. 25.

their

their arguments, whereof they make great account, we haue therfore alledged, to the end all may know how badly they interpret the holy Scriptures, and by how friuolous reason they are perſwaded to forſake the Catholike fayth.

3. But euen this ſufficiency of Scripture which they pretẽd, they proue very fooliſhly by thoſe wordes of the Apoſtle, wherein he teacheth, that the Scripture is very profitable; as though forſooth euery thing which is profitable for obtayning ſome particuler end or purpoſe, were alſo abſolutely ſufficient then the which nothing can be ſpoken more abſurdly. The head truely is not only profitable, but alſo neceſſary, that a man may liue, but who I pray you will ſay that the head only without the reſt of the body is ſufficient for the lyfe of man. But to our late Aduerſaries to the end they may make this their diſcourſe or reaſon the ſtronger, ſay, that in humane thinges not euery thing which is profitable is alſo ſufficient, but in diuine matters whatſoeuer is profitable, is alſo ſufficient, wherynto *Iunius* like a fine young ſtripling addeth, that this can be ouerthrowne by no ſophiſtry. But who doth not ſee that the *Euchariſt* by the diuine vertue thereof is pro-

Ad Tim. 3. v. penult.

Iunius cõtra Bell. controu. 1. lib. 4. c. 10. nota 44.

profitable to the obtayning of eternall ſalnation, and yet notwithſtanding without *Baptiſme* it is not ſufficiēt, as alſo without faith and pennance: the ſame may be ſayd of Baptiſme and of euery booke of Scripture. Yea euen the Apoſtle doth not ſpeake of the whole Scripture, as our Aduerſaries thinke he doth, when he ſaith, that euery Scripture is profitable, but of euery particuler part thereof. For how could he ſpeake of a thing which was not then extant. But as then the Ghoſpell of *S. Iohn* was not yet written nor the Apocalyps. For theſe were after *S. Pauls* death written by *S. Iohn*: hence it is that the Apoſtle *S. Paul* doth not ſay the whole Scripture, but euen Scripture inſpired by God is profitable. For there is not one parte of Scripture which is not profitable vnto vs if it be well vnderſtood. Yea for all that notwithſtanding euery one part preciſely in it ſelfe abſtracting from the reſt of the Scripture (as all do very well know) is not ſufficient.

S. Hier. de Script. Eccleſ. in Ioan Apoſt. 2. ad Tim. 3. v. penult.

4. Finally it is alſo to be conſidered that all thoſe places wherin the integrity, perfection and vtility of the Scripture is commended vnto vs, muſt needes be vnderſtood not of the bare wordes only, but of the ſame well and rightly vnderſtood.

Supra c. 3.

But

But this true vnderstanding of the words cannot otherwise be had then by Tradition and the vnwritten doctrine of the Church it selfe, as we haue already declared. Wherefore all those places which do commend vnto vs the holy Scriptures, do also consequently cõmend vnto vs Traditions and the vnwritten Word of God, seing that therein consisteth the principal part of holy Scripture, to wit, the true sense of the wordes. *Supra c. 6*

CHAP. XI.

Wherein is declared how we may know the Apostolicall Traditions.

AMONG the other arguments of our Aduersaries this is one that we cannot know certainly which are the *Traditions* of the Apostles, seing that many Heretikes in times past pretented also that their heresyes were agreing to Apostolicall Traditions. Moreouer they obiect that *Traditions* may easily be corrupted and changed, and for this cause, Scripture was ordayned that the doctrine deliuered by word of

mouth might continue the longer without any falsification or corruption. But we anſwere to this their reaſon: that the auncient Heretikes alſo by ſuppoſed and falſe Scriptures which they attributed falſely to the Apoſtles, did confirme and proue their hereſies. *Many things, ſaith S. Auguſtine, were alleadged by heretikes as though they were the ſayings of the Prophets and Apoſtles. But yet for all that they were not iudged to be the moſt certaine and Canonicall Scriptures.*

S Aug. de Ciuit. Dei l. 15. c. 23. ſub finem.

2. But the Traditions of the Apoſtles may ſo certainly and eaſily be known from ſuppoſed and falſe Traditions, as the Canonical Scriptures may be knowne from the Apocriphall, for they are both knowne by the ſame meanes and authority, that is to ſay, by the authority, doctrine, and teſtimony of the Catholike Church, which neyther can deceiue any nor be deceyued her ſelfe.

3. And albeit ſpeaking of humane matters the Scripture is more certaine the Tradition alone, yet it hapneth otherwiſe in matters concerning God, becauſe in theſe there is the authority of God, and the continuall aſſiſtance of the holy Ghoſt hath place, which doth not ſuffer the Church to erre, and hence it is, that the Tradition only of the Church which

is

is not so much written in paper as is printed in the hartes of Christians, is a most certayne, and faithfull keeper of all the pointes of our diuine faith. 2. ad Cor. 3. v. 3.

4. Moreouer, if euen Christ himself had with his owne hand writtē in brasse all the pointes of our faith, they should notwithstanding not haue had so great certainty, as now Ecclesiasticall Traditions haue, vnlesse the same keeper of the diuine doctrine had byn also present. For that which is imprinted in brasse, may be rased and blotted out, and the brasse it selfe may be consumed by fyre. But those thinges which are imprinted in the hartes of Christians by the holy Ghost, can neuer perish, or be any way changed.

5. And what we haue said of knowing the Apostolicall Traditions, is to be vnderstood whether the Church assembled in a generall Councel declared it so, or it became knowne and manifest by the continuall and generall custome of the whole Church. Also, whether the question be of Tradition belonging to faith, or only belonging to rites and Ceremonyes. For of the Tradition belonging to faith (that is to say, of not baptizing againe those which are baptized once before by heretikes) are these wordes of S. Angu-

S. Aug. Tom. 7. contra Creſcon. Grammat. l. 1. cap. penult.

Auguſtine. Albeit indeed of this thing, ſaith he, there can no example be alleadged out of Canonicall Scriptures, yet notwithſtanding we hold the truth of the ſame holy Scriptures in this matter, when we do that which generally the whole Catholike Church holdeth, the which euen the authority of the Scriptures themſelues commend vnto vs: ſo as, becauſe the holy Scripture cannot erre, whoſoeuer feareth to be deceaued by the difficultie or obſcuritie of this queſtion, let him go to the ſame Church for counſell, the which the holy Scripture very clearely sheweth and demonſtrateth vnto vs. Hitherto S. Auguſtine.

S. Aug. Tom. 7. de baptiſmo contra Donatiſt. l. 4. cap. 24.

And diſputing in another place againſt the Donatiſts, concerning the baptiſme of Infants. That, ſaith he, which the whole Catholike Church holdeth, nor was ordayned by generall Councells, but yet alwaies kept and obſerued by all, is moſt truly to be beleeued to haue byn deliuered vnto vs by Apoſtolicall authority.

S. Aug. Tom. 2. Epiſt. 118. ad Ianuar. c. 5. Calu. l. 4. Inſtit. c. 4. ſect. vltima ſub finem, & l. 3. c. 3. ſect. 10. in medio.

6. But of the Eccleſiaſticall rites and Ceremonies, the ſame S. Auguſtine ſpeaketh in this manner. If the Catholike Church through the whole world hold and practiſe any thing, it is a ſigne of great madneſſe to diſpute, whether it is to be done ſo or noe. By which wordes of S. Auguſtine it may eaſily be vnderſtood what was the opinion and vniforme doctrine of the whole auncient Church concerning this point. For our Aduerſaries themſelues do ſay, that S. Auguſtine was a moſt faith-

faithfull witneſſe of antiquity, vnto whome I referre the Readers, if they deſire to know certainly any more of the ſenſe of Antiquity.

The end of the ſecond Part of the firſt Controuerſy.

FINIS.